

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

HELD IN WASHINGTON, D. C., FEBRUARY 22,
1946

The fourth meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts during the fiscal year 1946 was held in its office in the Interior Department Building, on Friday, February 22, 1946. The following members were present:

Mr. Clarke, Chairman,
Mr. Aldrich,
Mr. Reinhard,
Mr. Sterne,
Mr. Murphy,
Mr. Lawrie,

also H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary

and Administrative Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The Minutes of the Meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, held on January 28, 1946, were approved, subject to the omission of some matters of detail mentioned in connection with proposed changes at the Capitol.

2. NATHAN HALE STATUE: The Secretary reported that on Wednesday afternoon, February 13th, Mr. Douglas W. Orr, FAIA, architect, of New Haven, was in Washington, and, in company with Mr. Finley and Mr. Murphy, Major Fox and the Secretary, inspected the location recommended for the Nathan Hale statue on the Constitution Avenue side of the Department of Justice building. At that Committee meeting it was agreed that the statue should not be placed in front of the main entrance to the building, since it is too small for that location and would conflict with large aluminum lighting fixtures flanking the building, but rather at the side against the wall. Mr. Orr said he wish to confer with Mr. C. C. Zantzinger, one of the architects of the Department of Justice building, before proceeding with a sketch of the pedestal, which will be submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts in due time.

FOR THE YEAR ENDING DECEMBER 31, 1940

THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REALTORS

WAS HELD AT THE HOTEL MAYFLOWER, NEW YORK CITY, ON JANUARY 15, 1941.

THE FOLLOWING MEMBERS WERE PRESENT:

- MR. J. H. HARRIS, Chairman
- MR. J. H. HARRIS, Vice Chairman
- MR. J. H. HARRIS, Secretary
- MR. J. H. HARRIS, Treasurer
- MR. J. H. HARRIS, Director
- MR. J. H. HARRIS, Director
- MR. J. H. HARRIS, Director
- MR. J. H. HARRIS, Director
- MR. J. H. HARRIS, Director
- MR. J. H. HARRIS, Director

AND THE FOLLOWING MEMBERS WERE ABSENT:

MR. J. H. HARRIS, Director

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 10:00 A.M.

THE MEETING WAS OPENED BY THE CHAIRMAN, MR. J. H. HARRIS.

THE REPORT OF THE SECRETARY, MR. J. H. HARRIS, WAS APPROVED.

THE REPORT OF THE TREASURER, MR. J. H. HARRIS, WAS APPROVED.

THE REPORT OF THE DIRECTORS, MR. J. H. HARRIS, WAS APPROVED.

THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 1:00 P.M.

THE MEETING WAS ATTENDED BY 100 MEMBERS.

THE MEETING WAS HELD AT THE HOTEL MAYFLOWER, NEW YORK CITY.

THE MEETING WAS OPENED BY THE CHAIRMAN, MR. J. H. HARRIS.

THE REPORT OF THE SECRETARY, MR. J. H. HARRIS, WAS APPROVED.

THE REPORT OF THE TREASURER, MR. J. H. HARRIS, WAS APPROVED.

THE REPORT OF THE DIRECTORS, MR. J. H. HARRIS, WAS APPROVED.

THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 1:00 P.M.

THE MEETING WAS ATTENDED BY 100 MEMBERS.

THE MEETING WAS HELD AT THE HOTEL MAYFLOWER, NEW YORK CITY.

THE MEETING WAS OPENED BY THE CHAIRMAN, MR. J. H. HARRIS.

THE REPORT OF THE SECRETARY, MR. J. H. HARRIS, WAS APPROVED.

THE REPORT OF THE TREASURER, MR. J. H. HARRIS, WAS APPROVED.

THE REPORT OF THE DIRECTORS, MR. J. H. HARRIS, WAS APPROVED.

THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 1:00 P.M.

3. DESIGN FOR R. F. C. BUILDING: In accordance with requirements, the Inspector of Buildings of the District of Columbia submitted a design for an R. F. C. Office Building, to be built at the corner of Connecticut Avenue and H Street, diagonally opposite Lafayette Park (Shipstead-Luce Act Submission No.1068, dated February 5, 1946). It was designed to be a twelve-story building, with set-backs and pent house that would bring it to the 130 foot limit, allowed by the Zoning Regulations, or approximately to that height; to be faced with limestone; Harvey Warwick, of Washington, architect.

The Secretary reported that on receipt of the plans he inquired of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation whether or not a Government loan was being secured for the building and was informed that "A loan in the amount of \$1,650,000 has been approved by this Company to Jerry Miatico" for this building.

At a Committee Meeting held in New York City in the office of the Chairman on February 11th, the architect members of the Commission, Messrs. Aldrich, Reinhard and Murphy, inspected the design, and in general considered the design to be unacceptable for that important location near the White House. Attention was called to the United States Chamber of Commerce Building nearby and to the Lafayette Building at the opposite corner of the park.

The design was given further consideration at the meeting of the Commission. The Commission criticized the long line of show windows on the first floor; the Commission recommended modification by breaking the line with piers; the design should also be considered in relation to the adjacent Transportation Building. In particular the Commission protested against the glass front at the corner of H Street and Connecticut Avenue, going up twelve stories, and recommended stone instead, with a break at the top.

On the recommendation of the architect members of the Commission, the

Commission of Fine Arts disapproved the design, and the Inspector of Buildings was notified accordingly.

Mr. Reinhard was designated by the Commission to confer with the architect, Mr. Warwick, and the builder, Mr. Miatico, explaining the criticisms by the Commission, and requesting a revised design.

(A revised design was received February 23, 1946, and was sent to the architect members of the Commission for consideration)

4. BRANCH PUBLIC LIBRARY, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA: Mr. Nathan C. Wyeth, Municipal Architect, submitted a design for the Pleasant Plains Branch Library, to be built on Fairmont Street, near Georgia Avenue, Northwest, in the vicinity of Howard University. Mr. Wyeth informed the Secretary that the building as designed was a departure from the traditional branch libraries in the city, and since about a dozen are contemplated he wanted to know whether or not the Commission of Fine Arts would favor a design as this in modern style. The floor plan indicated that back of a long glass front at the right is the reading room, and back of a walled surface on the left the entrance, stairway and office rooms.

The Commission inspected the design and disapproved it, saying it lacks proportion and distinction. The Commission concurred in the criticism by Mr. Aldrich that "The Commission believe it possible to get an expression of the modern trend without going to the extreme as indicated in this design (Exhibit A).

5. DESIGN FOR TOURIST INFORMATION BUILDING: The Secretary submitted a design for a Tourist Information Building, proposed for construction by A. R. Rowles, 4800 Georgia Avenue, at Sixth Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, Northwest, with the statement that he is a disabled World War I Veteran and wants to erect this sight-seeing booth and information center, using a dismantled touring bus supported on masonry foundation. It is to be a temporary structure until the

Commission of Fine Arts approved the design, and the Director of Buildings was notified accordingly.

Mr. Nathan was designated by the Commission to confer with the architect,

Mr. Nathan, and the architect, Mr. Nathan, explaining the criticism by the

Commission, and suggesting a revised design.

(A revised design was received January 23, 1943, and was sent to the

Commission for their consideration.)

Mr. Nathan, Director of Buildings, Mr. Nathan, Mr. Nathan, Mr. Nathan,

Mr. Nathan, Mr. Nathan, Mr. Nathan, Mr. Nathan, Mr. Nathan, Mr. Nathan,

to be built on Belmont Street, near Second Avenue, Northwest, in the vicinity

of Belmont University. Mr. Nathan advised the architect that the building as

designed was a departure from the traditional style of buildings in the city,

and that about a dozen are contemplated to be built in the future or not the

Commission of Fine Arts would have a look at this in modern style. The

floor plan indicated that each of the four plans fronted on the right in the rear

room, and back of the main entrance on the left the entrance, stairway and

office room.

The Commission approved the design and approved it, saying it looked

proportion and character. The Commission considered in the criticism by

Mr. Nathan that the Commission wishes it possible to get an impression of the

modern trend without going to the extent as indicated in this design (Nathan).

2. Nathan and Mr. Nathan, Mr. Nathan, Mr. Nathan, Mr. Nathan, Mr. Nathan,

Mr. Nathan, Mr. Nathan, Mr. Nathan, Mr. Nathan, Mr. Nathan, Mr. Nathan,

Mr. Nathan, Mr. Nathan, Mr. Nathan, Mr. Nathan, Mr. Nathan, Mr. Nathan,

Mr. Nathan, Mr. Nathan, Mr. Nathan, Mr. Nathan, Mr. Nathan, Mr. Nathan,

Mr. Nathan, Mr. Nathan, Mr. Nathan, Mr. Nathan, Mr. Nathan, Mr. Nathan,

Mr. Nathan, Mr. Nathan, Mr. Nathan, Mr. Nathan, Mr. Nathan, Mr. Nathan,

site is needed for the District Library building.

The Commission considered the matter and disapproved the idea of using a dismantled touring bus. The Commission advised that Mr. Rowles should get a good architect to design a small building, and the matter was referred to Mr. Murphy with power to act.

6. PAN AMERICAN ANNEX: The Secretary presented a set of photostat prints of the Pan American Annex, submitted by the architects, Harbeson, Hough, Livingston and Larson, of Philadelphia, successors to the late Dr. Cret. The Commission took note of the fact that these plans had been approved by the Commission of Fine Arts in December, 1934, but that the project has been held in abeyance because of objection by Secretary of the Interior Ickes to having the Annex in front of the Interior Department Building. Since Mr. Ickes resigned on February 15, 1946, action on the design was desired by the architects and by Dr. L. S. Rowe, Director General of the Pan American Union.

The Commission inspected the design and approved it, thus reconfirming the action taken in December, 1934. It was suggested that further study be given to the Virginia Avenue side of the building, so that it would not give the impression that the Interior Department Building was facing the rear of another building.

Major General U. S. Grant, Chairman of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, was present and reported that at a meeting of his Commission held on February 21, 1946, the location of the building on the triangle at Nineteenth Street and Constitution Avenue, as authorized by Congress on December 23, 1929, was approved.

General Grant called attention to some sketches made by the staff of his Commission offering some ideas for the treatment on the north side of

It is noted for the historic building.

The Commission considered the matter and approved the plan of work.

A preliminary survey was made. The Commission advised that Mr. Taylor should be

a good candidate to design a small building, and the matter was referred to

Mr. Murphy with power to act.

2. The Commission's action: The Secretary presented a set of proposals

which of the two methods, suggested by the architect, Messrs. Taylor, Taylor,

Livingston and Taylor, or the building, suggested to the late Mr. Gray. The

Commission took note of the fact that some plans had been approved by the

Commission at the time in December, 1923, and that the project had been said

in response because of objection by Secretary of the Interior to having

the annex in front of the Interior Department Building. Since Mr. Taylor

returned on February 12, 1924, action on the design was deferred by the architect

and Mr. I. J. Love, Director General of the San Antonio Union.

The Commission inspected the design and approved it, some modifications

the action taken in December, 1924. It was suggested that further study be

given to the design in view of the building, as that it would not give

the impression that the interior department building was facing the rear of

another building.

Major General E. C. Smith, Chairman of the National Capital Park and

Planning Commission, was present and presented that at a meeting of the Commission

held on February 22, 1924, the location of the building on the site of the

Interstate Office and Education Building, as suggested by the architect

December 12, 1923, was approved.

General Grant Taylor presented a plan suggested by the architect

the Commission advised that the plan for the treatment of the site of the

the building, but the Commission of Fine Arts did not approve them. General Grant said they were offered simply as ideas and that he felt some consideration might be given to locations for South American monuments as the late President Roosevelt had desired.

The Commission of Fine Arts decided that the architects of the Pan American Annex should give further study to the treatment of the ground area on the north side of the building. A report was sent to Dr. Rowe (Exhibit B) and to the architects a copy thereof (Exhibit B-1). See also Exhibit B-2.

7. IWO JIMA MEMORIAL, H. R. 5521: The Secretary reported that on February 19, 1946, Representative Larcade introduced a Bill, H. R. 5521, (Exhibit C) proposing the erection by the Navy Department of a World War II Memorial, portraying the flag raising on Iwo Jima. The Secretary called attention to the following statement which appeared in the Washington Post of February 20, 1946:

\$100,000 War Statue
Proposed in House Bill

A \$100,000 statue to be placed either in Washington or Arlington County as a memorial to fighting men of World War II was proposed in the House yesterday in a bill by Representative Henry D. Larcade, jr., (D.;La).

Larcade said the proposed permanent memorial would be identical with a temporary one at Constitution and Virginia Avenues, N.W., showing six servicemen raising the American Flag on Iwo Jima. The temporary statue is to be removed March 1, he said.

The Commission disapproved the use of the model for the purpose as above indicated, and the matter was referred to Mr. Lawrie for a report to be sent to the Hon. Fritz G. Lanham, Chairman of the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whose Committee the Bill has been referred (Exhibit C-1).

It was stated that the National Sculpture Society is protesting against having a statue cast from the model above mentioned.

the building, but the Commission of this fact did not approve them, because
Grant said they were altered slightly in place and that he felt some consid-
eration might be given to location for local business men as the law
President Roosevelt had desired.

The Commission of this fact advised that the President of the American
Nation should give further study to the treatment of the ground area on the north
side of the building. A report was sent to Mr. Howe (Exhibit 8) and to the

Executive a copy thereof (Exhibit 9-1). See also Exhibit 8-1.

7. The Commission, in its report: The Secretary reported that on

February 10, 1941, Representative Lammie introduced a bill, H. R. 5321,

(Exhibit 10) proposing the creation of the Navy Department of a small war II

Memorial, portraying the flag raising on Iwo Jima. The Secretary called

attention to the following statement which appeared in the Washington Post

of February 20, 1941:

150,000 men to be
trained in Iwo Jima

A 150,000 man force to be placed at Iwo Jima in Washington on
Washington Island, as a memorial to Iwo Jima, was
would be II was proposed in the House yesterday in a
bill of Representative Lammie, H. R. 5321.
Lammie said the proposed memorial would
be identical with a temporary one at Iwo Jima and
Washington Island, H. R. 5321, showing the services of Iwo Jima
the memorial flag on Iwo Jima. The temporary one is
to be removed June 1, he said.

The Commission disapproved the use of the model for the purpose as

above indicated, and the matter was referred to Mr. Lammie for a report

to be sent to the House. With Mr. Lammie, Chairman of the House Committee on

Public Buildings and Grounds, to whose Committee the bill has been

referred (Exhibit 9-1).

It was stated that the National Geographic Society is preparing a

model a statue cast from the model above mentioned.

8. MEDAL OF FREEDOM: The Secretary brought to the attention of the Commission a photograph of the revised model by Thomas Hudson Jones, sculptor, for the obverse of the Medal of Freedom. Mr. Lawrie gave the photograph particular attention and expressed the desire to see the model. The Commission concurred with Mr. Lawrie in this matter, and, accordingly, a request was made by letter to have the model submitted to the Commission (Exhibit D).

Mr. Sterne asked about procedure in matters of this kind and thought the Commission should have more authority. Mr. Clarke stated that the Commission has only advisory power, but stated that this can be made very effective.

The Chairman protested against the way the General Staff of the War Department is handling World War II medal matters. A request for a revised model for this medal was made by the Commission of Fine Arts in June, 1945, but this photograph was not received from the War Department until February 18, 1946, and it was rumored that the General Staff had directed that medals be struck. A similar situation is pending with the American Campaign Medal.

Chairman Clarke stated that as soon as the War Department advises concerning the status of the Medal of Freedom, he then proposes to write to the Secretary of War explaining the difficulties encountered with the General Staff in the matter of medals for the War Department. The Commission concurred fully in this matter.

9. WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT: Major General U. S. Grant III, Chairman of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, submitted a general plan for the further development of the National Airport, made by the Public Buildings Administration. The Commission concurred with him that the design should be given careful study. A design for a Gasoline Service Station was disapproved (Exhibit E). It was pointed out that by this plan the Airport would more than double its size.

10. CHANGES IN THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CHAMBERS: Hon. David Lynn, Architect of the Capitol, accompanied by Mr. Edwin H. King, Superintendent of Construction at the Capitol; Mr. Francis P. Sullivan, architect for the project to make improvements in the Senate and House of Representatives chambers; and Mr. John F. Harbeson, representing the firm of Harbeson, Hough, Livingston & Larson, associate architects, of Philadelphia, presented plans to the Commission for this project. Mr. Sullivan explained the project by saying:

A few years ago it was discovered that the roof of each of the Chambers was becoming weak. The trusses were found to be in a very bad shape, having been installed about 1860. To make the ceiling safe it was necessary either to suspend the ceiling by new trusses or do it in some other manner. A steel framework was installed temporarily in both House and Senate chambers to uphold the ceiling.

The Senate advised that they wanted not only the ceiling to be made safe but also the lighting and acoustics improved, and this is a problem still. The Senators are not going to be happy if we give them a most beautiful room without improving the lighting and acoustics.

It seemed that changes in acoustics and lighting involved so many changes that it became necessary to replace the architectural treatment of the room somewhat, and there didn't seem to be any point in preserving the poor character of the architecture of the Chambers of the period of 1860. So that in redesigning certain problems had to be met. Also certain conditions were laid down by Members and certain conditions seem to me should be followed:

1. The rooms have a certain familiar appearance; everyone is used to them and radically to change the parti is inadvisable. They have the association of a certain era, so it seems advisable to keep the general appearance of the rooms. We have in the Capitol two contrasting periods of architecture represented,--that of the old and that of the period of 1860; and to introduce a third period still would be a mistake. So in this case the Senators said the architect would be justified in keeping the traditional style. We have brought designs and photographs. There is a Greek character in the old parts of the building but not very strong, and there are evidences of the somewhat modern version of some of the Georgian architecture. They called it Early Federal. The Chambers are important because of what goes on in them.

2. In my first studies I set up the orders and pilasters and it seemed to me it gave the room too much architecture; that seemed to me would be a mistake. The Senators thought there should be a series of tablets to represent the Treaty making power of the Senate, and emblems of States, which the Senators represent.

10. The first thing I noticed when I entered the room was the smell of the paint. It was a strong, sweet smell, like the smell of a new house. I had heard that the room was being renovated, but I didn't realize it was so new. The walls were a light color, and the floor was polished. The room was very bright, and I could see everything clearly. I was a little nervous, but I felt like I was in a new place. I had heard that the room was being renovated, but I didn't realize it was so new. The walls were a light color, and the floor was polished. The room was very bright, and I could see everything clearly. I was a little nervous, but I felt like I was in a new place.

A few years ago it was a very old room, and the walls were a dark color. The floor was made of wood, and it was very old. The room was very dark, and I could not see anything clearly. I was a little nervous, but I felt like I was in a new place. I had heard that the room was being renovated, but I didn't realize it was so new. The walls were a light color, and the floor was polished. The room was very bright, and I could see everything clearly. I was a little nervous, but I felt like I was in a new place.

The room was very old, and the walls were a dark color. The floor was made of wood, and it was very old. The room was very dark, and I could not see anything clearly. I was a little nervous, but I felt like I was in a new place. I had heard that the room was being renovated, but I didn't realize it was so new. The walls were a light color, and the floor was polished. The room was very bright, and I could see everything clearly. I was a little nervous, but I felt like I was in a new place.

It seemed that changes in the room were being made. The walls were being painted a light color, and the floor was being polished. The room was very bright, and I could see everything clearly. I was a little nervous, but I felt like I was in a new place. I had heard that the room was being renovated, but I didn't realize it was so new. The walls were a light color, and the floor was polished. The room was very bright, and I could see everything clearly. I was a little nervous, but I felt like I was in a new place.

1. The room was very old, and the walls were a dark color. The floor was made of wood, and it was very old. The room was very dark, and I could not see anything clearly. I was a little nervous, but I felt like I was in a new place. I had heard that the room was being renovated, but I didn't realize it was so new. The walls were a light color, and the floor was polished. The room was very bright, and I could see everything clearly. I was a little nervous, but I felt like I was in a new place.

2. In my first studies I set up the room and the floor. I was a little nervous, but I felt like I was in a new place. I had heard that the room was being renovated, but I didn't realize it was so new. The walls were a light color, and the floor was polished. The room was very bright, and I could see everything clearly. I was a little nervous, but I felt like I was in a new place.

3. The question of ceiling I leave for the moment.

4. In the House of Representatives there is a fresco by Brumidi, portraying a scene of General Washington at his Headquarters in Yorktown, 1781. It is one of the first mural paintings in the country and I thought that it should be preserved. But it involves placing pilasters in front of it. I think some sculpture and painting can be used effectively.

Thereupon Mr. Harbeson explained his designs. Mr. Harbeson said:

"As Mr. Sullivan said, the ceiling question is not completed yet. We need more discussion with the lighting expert and the specialist in acoustics. We are considering a series of coffers for the ceiling. We have tried to retain the early American architectural style--the European classicism. Our proposition is that the wall be lighted, but this is something that has to be worked out with the acoustical expert. We suggest a visible light source in the ceiling of low power so that light does not seem to come from a concerted source.

"Mr. Sullivan has mentioned acouston, which is a sort of wall tile; it was used in the Scottish Rite Temple. We feel, however, it would be preferable to have fabric, something less cold than stone. The Brumidi mural (measuring 11 x 9 feet) is a fine thing, but we would like to see it taken out; it would be bad to have pilasters in front of it. It could be taken out and placed in the Smithsonian, or possibly the National Gallery of Art, where people could see it continually. The flag, clock, the Washington and Lafayette portraits, should be retained.

"For the Senate we have suggested an oval ceiling; for the House of Representatives a rectangular ceiling. Just how high it is to be and how lighted still has to be settled with the lighting and acoustical experts. The best acoustical expert in the country is being consulted, Mr. Sabin. The lighting expert is Mr. McCandliss.

Thereupon Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Harbeson retired, while the Commission discussed the designs with Mr. Lynn. Mr. Lynn said:

"We have this very unusual situation. We don't want to embarrass the architects and we feel some responsibility to you. I talked with two members of the Subcommittee, Senator Aiken and the Speaker of the House. Senator Aiken's idea is to have the rooms designed simply; he doesn't want to have them too elaborate but quiet and dignified so that when they come into the Chambers they will not be met by too great changes in them. He didn't like the white marble (indicated in Mr. Sullivan's design) and wants some color.

"There has been little publicity given to the designs for changes. The Senators and Members of the House are very much pleased with the old part of the Capitol and they hope it could be carried to the Senate Chamber. There is not a great departure in the presentation of the two schemes.

Mr. Murphy said: I think sincere effort has been made to carry out the tradition, which is very important, and I think the design shows a presentation of the room in the style that is proper to the building. The general character of the two schemes are quite alike, and with acoustics and lighting there are the given elements; there may be ways of treating the rooms, but for the present we have to cope with those scientific things in architecture. I think the center scheme (Mr. Harbeson's) is better; leave out the niches and the chamber will be more restful.

Mr. Aldrich and Mr. Reinhard concurred with Mr. Murphy in these comments and criticisms and likewise Mr. Lynn.

It was thought desirable, by Mr. Aldrich, to get extra height in the Chambers and consequently in the galleries. He suggested that this might be secured by raising the roof over the Chambers. Mr. Lynn said that while it might be desirable to raise the roof, Congress will adjourn in four months, by the end of June, and it will be necessary to begin on the construction then and have it finished when Congress reconvenes, perhaps in November. Mr. Aldrich emphasized that ample time should be allowed to prepare the designs for this project.

After further discussion of the details of the designs submitted, it was decided unanimously by all present that the designs submitted by Mr. Harbeson's firm, in collaboration with Mr. Sullivan, dated February 21, 1946, be approved in principle, with the understanding that the architectural problems related to the details pertaining to acoustics, lighting and air-conditioning, will have to be studied further and in collaboration with the consultants representing these specialized fields.

Mr. Murphy said: I think it is important to have the
the tradition, which is very important, and I think it is
the tradition of the work in the world is proper to the tradition. The
general character of the work is very different, and the work is
lighting there are the same character; there are the same character
to me, but the present is to have the same character in the
character. I think the character is different; I have
out the character and the character is the same.
Mr. Murphy and Mr. Murphy are interested in the character
and character and character in the character.
It is the character of the character, to the character in the
character and character in the character. The character and character
to the character of the character. Mr. Murphy said that the
that is the character of the character, the character in the character,
the end of the character, and it will be necessary to have the character
and have it character in the character, the character in the character.
emphasized the character of the character to have the character for the
project.
After further discussion of the character of the character, it
was decided unanimously by all present that the character of the
Mr. Murphy's character, in character with Mr. Murphy, dated February 21,
1940, be approved in character, and the character of the character
proposed be added to the character of the character, lighting and the
character, will have to be character in the character and the character
the character to have the character of the character.

It was recommended that the incomplete collection of about half a dozen busts of Speakers, in the House of Representatives Chamber, be omitted in the new design. Mr. Lynn said he thought that this could be done, since there is a portrait of every Speaker of the House of Representatives in the Capitol. On the Senate side there is a marble bust of every Vice President of the United States; a number of them are in the Senate Chamber; these can be retained.

Thereupon Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Harbeson returned to the Commission room and Chairman Clarke made the following statement to them:

"We have discussed this matter and unanimously arrived at the conclusion that the drawings we call the joint submission by Mr. Harbeson and Mr. Sullivan have our unanimous approval. They (that is the one for the Senate and the other for the House Chamber) are in principle acceptable to the Commission of Fine Arts, leaving for later solution, after your conference with the lighting, acoustical, and air conditioning experts, the question of design of the ceiling. If when you have worked that out and have secured the best results obtainable with reference to those problems, you will come back we can discuss further your later studies for these Chambers. We would like to have you consider taking out the busts from the House Chamber, for it will make possible a more dignified continuous fabric for the wall treatment. It is also very desirable to have the fresco by Brumidi in the House Chamber taken out, and placed possibly in the Smithsonian or the National Gallery of Art."

Mr. Lynn expressed to the Commission his sincere appreciation for the assistance given on this important project.

A report was sent to Mr. Lynn (Exhibit F).

It was recommended that the investigation of these cases be
made more of a priority, in the sense of a special investigation, as
indicated in the report of the Committee on the subject of the
cases, which shows a picture of every case of the Committee on
the subject. On the subject of the cases, it is noted that of every
five cases of the United States, a number of cases are in the United
States; these can be treated.

Mr. Thompson, Mr. Sullivan and Mr. [unclear] returned to the Committee

room and Mr. Thompson made the following statement to them:

"We have discussed this matter and unanimously agreed at the

conclusion that the drawings we call the [unclear] drawings of Mr. Thompson

and Mr. Sullivan have not unanimous approval. They (that is the one

for the [unclear] and the other for the [unclear]) are in principle

acceptable to the Committee on the subject, leaving the [unclear]

after your conference with the [unclear], [unclear], and [unclear]

before, the [unclear] of cases on the subject. It seems you have worked

out of the [unclear] and [unclear] [unclear] with reference to

these [unclear], you will [unclear] as can be seen from your letter

of the [unclear]. It seems like to have you [unclear] [unclear]

out the [unclear] from the [unclear], for it will make possible to have

the [unclear] [unclear] [unclear] for the [unclear]. It is the [unclear]

of the [unclear] of the [unclear] in the [unclear] [unclear] out

and [unclear] [unclear] in the [unclear] or the [unclear] [unclear] of the

Mr. Thompson suggested to the Committee the [unclear] [unclear] for the

assistance given on this important project.

A report was sent to Mr. [unclear] (Sullivan?).

11. THE WHITE HOUSE: The Commission were in conference with Hon. H. G. Crim, Chief Usher of the White House, and Mr. Lorenzo S. Winslow, Architect.

Chairman Clarke stated that on Saturday afternoon, February 16th, he and Mr. Murphy appeared before the Executive Committee of the American Institute of Architects, held at The Octagon, at the request of the Committee, to explain the situation regarding the proposed extension of the Executive Offices. Mr. Clarke said they were well received,--"We told them the needs of the President of the United States, and that the extension did not mar the appearance of the White House grounds. Before going over to their meeting, I looked at the 'barns' which the Park Commission of 1901 indicated on the model we have here for the Executive Offices. I think the Executive Board of the Institute is satisfied. The protests did not come from the national organization but from the local chapter; and as I understand it not even by a vote of the Chapter. The President of the Institute asked us only one question, 'If this is done, is it temporary, and when taken out will it be possible to restore the grounds; to which we replied 'Yes'."

The American Institute of Architects issued a Press Release on February 16th, which "Calls for immediate provision of working space for President Truman." (Exhibit G)

The Secretary reported that the Senate had made allowance for improving the White House grounds, etc., but no money is to be spent for enlarging the Executive Offices, by adopting the following amendment (H.R. 5201, adopted February 18, 1946, page 3):

"PROVIDED, That of the \$1,650,000 appropriated in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946 (Public Law 269, Seventy-ninth Congress, ch. 589, first session), under the head 'Executive Office of the President' and the subhead 'Executive Mansion and Grounds'

11. The Committee on the Constitution and the Rules of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on the Administration of the House of Representatives, have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th inst., and in reply to inform you that the same has been forwarded to the proper authorities for their consideration.

The Committee on the Constitution and the Rules of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on the Administration of the House of Representatives, have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th inst., and in reply to inform you that the same has been forwarded to the proper authorities for their consideration.

The Committee on the Constitution and the Rules of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on the Administration of the House of Representatives, have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th inst., and in reply to inform you that the same has been forwarded to the proper authorities for their consideration.

The Committee on the Constitution and the Rules of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on the Administration of the House of Representatives, have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th inst., and in reply to inform you that the same has been forwarded to the proper authorities for their consideration.

The Committee on the Constitution and the Rules of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on the Administration of the House of Representatives, have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th inst., and in reply to inform you that the same has been forwarded to the proper authorities for their consideration.

for an addition to the Executive Mansion, alterations, improvements and furnishings and improvement of grounds, \$870,000 shall be returned to the Treasury, and of the remaining unexpended balance of said appropriation of \$1,650,000 no part shall be used for an addition to the West Executive Offices."

Mr. Crim said the appropriation item is now in conference and that there is hope in the White House that the item for extension of the Executive Offices will be allowed as originally intended. The Senate item, he said, provides for completing the East Wing, making improvements in the White House such as new floors and a new heating plant, and also somewhat over \$200,000 for landscaping.

Mr. Clarke asked if the Committee on White House Furnishings would receive any funds. Mr. Crim replied that he thought there would be about \$30,000 available for the Committee. The stanchions around the President's Seal at the entrance to the White House have been removed.

Mr. Clarke said as a landscape architect he was much interested in an appropriate treatment of the White House grounds, and would be glad to advise as to the services of a competent landscape architect (Exhibit H).

Mr. Crim stated that a model of the White House grounds is now being made and should be ready soon.

12. NEW DESIGNS FOR COINS: Chairman Clarke reported that recently he received the following letter from the President of the National Sculpture Society, 1083 Fifth Avenue, New York City, regarding U. S. coins:

February 13, 1946.

Dear Mr. Clarke:

We are informed that the period between issues of certain coins of the United States currency will expire soon and that among other coins, a new design for the half dollar will be in order. Possibly the silver dollar will also require a new design.

The close attention paid to all matters of design by the Commission of Fine Arts is most gratifying to the National Sculpture Society and it is with the intention of expressing our appreciation

that we now offer our support to any plan which you and the members of the Commission may promote. We realize that there are time-honored precedents for committing the important task of designing our coinage to others than sculptors. It is our conviction that the designs should be accepted only from sculptors who have earned distinction in this specialized field and we are glad to believe that this opinion is shared by the Commission of Fine Arts.

If you agree it will give me pleasure to appoint a committee to confer with you on the subject.

Sincerely yours,
Donald DeLue,
President.

The Chairman stated that he had sent a reply to Mr. DeLue offering cooperation in the matter (Exhibit I).

The Secretary reported that he secured the information desired by the Chairman from Mr. Leland Howard, Assistant Director of the Mint:

February 20, 1946.

MEMORANDUM FOR: Mr. Clarke:

I talked with Mr. Howard, Assistant Director of the Mint, about new designs for certain coins, this morning.

Mr. Howard said the Weinman 50 cent piece has been in use since 1916, and the Director of the Mint could authorize a new design if she wanted to (25 years having passed).

The Lincoln Penny was adopted in 1909; designed by Victor Brenner.

A new 25¢ piece is eligible in 1957. Flanagan's George Washington Quarter was adopted in 1932.

The Roosevelt Dime takes the place of Mr. Weinman's design of 1916.

H. P. C.

The Commission concurred in the suggestion of the Chairman that a letter be sent to the Secretary of the Treasury suggesting a competition among leading medallists for a new design for the 50-cent piece and the 1-cent piece. (Exhibit J)

13. DESIGNS FOR ADDITIONAL BUILDINGS FOR SAINT ELIZABETH'S HOSPITAL: Under date of February 11th the following letter was received from Mr. Underwood:

Commission of Fine Arts,
Washington, D.C.
Gentlemen:

On Saturday, February 2nd, I met with Mr. Gilmore Clarke,

that we have often the opportunity to say that this is the best
of the Commission's work. It is a fact that the Commission has
proceeded for some time past in the direction of doing the
work in a more efficient manner. It is our conviction that the
work is being done in a more efficient manner than in the
past. It is our conviction that the work is being done in a
more efficient manner than in the past.

If you agree it will give us pleasure to appoint a committee to
confer with you on the subject.

Sincerely yours,
W. H. H. H.
W. H. H. H.

The President stated that he had sent a reply to Mr. H. H. H. H.

convention in the matter (Exhibit 1).

The President stated that he had sent a reply to Mr. H. H. H. H.

the President stated that he had sent a reply to Mr. H. H. H. H.

Exhibit 1, 1911.

Exhibit 1, 1911.

Exhibit 1, 1911.

Exhibit 1, 1911.

Exhibit 1, 1911.

Exhibit 1, 1911.

Exhibit 1, 1911.

Exhibit 1, 1911.

Exhibit 1, 1911.

Exhibit 1, 1911.

Exhibit 1, 1911.

Exhibit 1, 1911.

Exhibit 1, 1911.

Exhibit 1, 1911.

Exhibit 1, 1911.

Exhibit 1, 1911.

Exhibit 1, 1911.

Exhibit 1, 1911.

Exhibit 1, 1911.

Chairman of the Fine Arts Commission, and Mr. Andrew Reinhard, Member.

I submitted the "Continued Treatment Building, St. Elizabeth's Hospital, Washington, D. C.," and "Laundry and Service Building." On February 7th

I submitted two projects to Mr. Frederick Murphy, Member of the Commission at his office in Washington.

The Chairman and the two Members approved the Laundry and Service Building without change. They approved the Continued Treatment Building with two changes:

1. Extend the center motif forward of the windows about 8 inches.
2. Study the plan of the entrance vestibule and make it more "open" in character instead of the rather narrow pinched-in plan on the submitted drawings.

Sketches of the two projects are attached hereto.

Cordially,
Gilbert Stanley Underwood,
Supervising Architect.

The Commission inspected the designs and upon the recommendation of the architect members of the Commission, the design for the two buildings were approved, subject to the changes above mentioned (Exhibit K)

Later in the day, the Chairman, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Lawrie and the Secretary made a trip of inspection to St. Elizabeth's Hospital and observed the style of buildings on the grounds.

14. LEIF ERICSON STATUE: The Chairman and Mr. Lawrie inspected several locations for the Leif Ericson statue, and decided to recommend to the Commission of Fine Arts a site near the Inlet Bridge in Potomac Park, where the statue would face the Potomac River. The Secretary was requested to report this fact to the National Park Service with a view to having a location plan prepared for consideration at the next meeting of the Commission (Exhibit L).

15. STATUE OF GEORGE WASHINGTON: The Chairman, and Mr. Lawrie, accompanied by the Secretary, made a trip of inspection to the Capitol Grounds and took a view of the East front, which had been considered appropriate for the statue of George Washington which Congress has authorized to be erected in the National Capital.

Mr. Lawrie stated that this statue of George Washington must have an outstanding location on the Capitol Grounds.

The location suggested at the January meeting of the Commission, namely, on the main Capitol steps, was thought inappropriate, in view of the conflict that would result with the two statues flanking the Capitol entrance.

The Secretary mentioned the fact that there is a pending plan to extend the central portion of the Capitol eastward, to be on a line with the flanking House and Senate chambers, as had been proposed by Thomas U. Walter, thereby adding 43 committee rooms to the Capitol that are now much needed. The Chairman stated that if this project is to be carried out the statue could be stored temporarily.

A letter was sent to Senator Green asking for his views regarding this suggested location for the statue. (Exhibit M) See also Exhibit M-1.

The Commission adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

15. STATUE OF GEORGE WASHINGTON: The Chairman, and Mr. Lawrie, accompanied by the Secretary, made a trip of inspection to the Capitol grounds and took a view of the East front, which had been considered appropriate for the statue of George Washington which Congress has authorized to be erected in the National Capital.

Mr. Lawrie stated that this statue of George Washington must have an outstanding location on the Capitol grounds.

The location suggested at the January meeting of the Commission, namely, on the main Capitol steps, was thought inappropriate, in view of the conflict that would result with the two statues flanking the Capitol entrance.

The Secretary mentioned the fact that there is a building plan to extend the central portion of the Capitol eastward, to be on a line with the Planning House and Senate chambers, and had been proposed by Thomas U. Walter, thereby adding 48 committee rooms to the Capitol that are now much needed. The Chairman stated that if this project is to be carried out the statue could be stored temporarily.

A letter was sent to Senator Green asking for his views regarding this suggested location for the statue. (Exhibit 11) See also Exhibit M-1.

The Commission adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

February 25, 1946.

Dear Mr. Wyeth:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on February 22nd, disapproved the design you submitted for a Public Library Branch building, to be built on Fairmont Street near Georgia Avenue.

The design lacks distinction. The Commission believe it possible to get an expression of the modern trend without going to the extreme as indicated in this design.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

GILMORE D. CLARKE,

Chairman.

Hon. Nathan C. Wyeth,
Municipal Architect,
District Building,
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT A

February 22, 1942.

Dear Mr. Wyeth:

The Commission of the Arts, at their meeting on February 22nd, disapproved the design you submitted for a Public Library branch building, to be built on Richmond Street near Georgia Avenue.

The design lacks distinction. The Commission believe it possible to get an expression of the modern trend without going to the extreme as indicated in this design.

For the Commission of the Arts:

Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE A. CLARK,

Chairman.

Hon. Nathan C. Wyeth,
Municipal Architect,
District Building,
Washington, D.C.

ENCLOSURE

February 25, 1945.

My dear Dr. Rowe:

I am pleased to inform you that at a meeting held on February 22, 1946, the Commission of Fine Arts reconfirmed the action taken on December 3, 1934, approving the design by the late Dr. Paul P. Cret for the Pan American Annex, to be built on the triangle authorized by Congress on December 23, 1929, at Constitution Avenue and Nineteenth Street, Northwest. The Commission had before them photostats of the approved design, which were submitted by Messrs. Harbeson, Hough, Livingston and Larson, Architects, successors to Dr. Cret.

The Commission recommend that the architects give further study to the area between this proposed building and the Interior Department Building. A suggestion has been made by the Planning Commission; I shall arrange to send you a print of their study. This is not satisfactory to the Commission, but it gives an idea of what they have in mind. I shall review this matter with the architects when I meet with them in connection with other matters.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

GILMORE D. CLARKE,

Chairman.

Dr. L. S. Rowe,
Director General,
Pan American Union,
Washington, D. C.

January 22, 1946

My dear Mr. Jones:

I am pleased to inform you that the meeting held on January 22, 1946, the Commission of the National Research Council, has taken on December 5, 1945, the design by the late Dr. Paul E. Traft for the new National Bureau of Standards building authorized by Congress on December 22, 1945, as constituted by the National Research Council, and the Commission has before them for review of the approved design, which was submitted by Messrs. Harwood, Egan, Johnson and Johnson, Architects, successors to Dr. Traft.

The Commission recommends that the architect give further study to the area between this proposed building and the interior department building. I suggested that the Commission should examine to see if there is a point of their study. This is not restricted to the building, but is given in fact of that they have in mind. I shall review the matter with the architect when I meet with them in connection with other matters.

For the Commission of the National Research Council:

Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE A. DAVIS

Chairman

Dr. H. E. Ross,
Director General,
National Bureau of Standards,
Washington, D. C.

February 25, 1946.

My dear Mr. Harbeson:

While you were here attending the meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts on February 22nd, it was my intention to inform you of the fact that the Commission reconfirmed its action in 1934, approving the design for the Pan American Annex. I enclose a copy of the letter we have sent to Dr. Rowe. You will note that the Commission suggest that further study be given to the area between this proposed building and the Interior Department.

Regarding further designs for the Capitol project, we shall arrange our next meeting to suit Mr. Lynn, that means, of course, when you are ready with further studies. It is assumed these will not be ready until the lighting, acoustical and air conditioning problems have been solved. I wish you would let me know personally when you will be ready with further studies. Two of our architect members are going to California in March, but if we could have a meeting the week of the 18th of March I think they would be present.

Sincerely yours,

GILMORE D. CLARKE,

Chairman.

Mr. John F. Harbeson, Architect,
1518 Walnut Street,
Philadelphia, Pa.

EXHIBIT B-1

February 14, 1964

My dear Mr. Harbo:son:

While you were away attending the meeting of the Commission of the Arts on February 10th, it was of course to discuss you of the fact that the Commission recommended its action in 1964, approving the design for the new western annex. I enclose a copy of the letter we have sent to Mr. Harbo. You will note that the Commission suggests that further study be given to the inter-relationship between this proposed building and the historic department. Regarding further looking for the classical project, we shall arrange our next meeting to suit Mr. Harbo, and of course, when you are back with further studies. It is assumed there will not be much until the lighting, electrical and air conditioning problems have been solved. I wish you would let us know personally when you will be ready for further studies. Two of our specialists are going to visit him in March, and as we could have a meeting the week of the 15th of March I think they could be present.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS J. HARBOSON

Chairman

Mr. John F. Harbo:son, President,
1115 Walnut Street,
Philadelphia, Pa.

COPY

Pan American Union
Washington, D.C.

March 1, 1946.

My dear Mr. Chairman:

Many thanks for your letter of February 25th. I am
delighted to learn that the Commission of Fine Arts has
reconfirmed the action taken in 1934 on the design for the
Pan American Annex.

are

As you/probably aware, the increase in cost of construction
has made it necessary for us to apply to the Carnegie Corporation
for an additional appropriation of \$427,109.68. Until this
action is taken we will not be able to proceed.

I want to take the opportunity again to express my deep
appreciation for your constant and unfailing helpfulness.

Very sincerely yours,

L. S. Rowe,

Director General

Gilmore D. Clarke, F. A. I. A.,
Chairman, The Commission of Fine Arts,
Interior Department Building,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT B-2

copy

Pan American Union
Washington, D.C.

March 1, 1934.

My dear Mr. Chairman:

Many thanks for your letter of February 28th. I am

delighted to learn that the Commission of Fine Arts has

reconfirmed the action taken in 1931 on the design for the

Pan American Annex.

As you probably aware, the increase in cost of construction
has made it necessary for us to apply to the Carnegie Corporation
for an additional appropriation of \$137,109.88. Until this

action is taken we will not be able to proceed.

I want to take the opportunity again to express my deep

appreciation for your constant and untiring helpfulness.

Very sincerely yours,

L. S. Howe,

Director General

Clifford W. Clough, F. A. I. A.,
Chairman, the Commission of Fine Arts,
Interior Department Building,
Washington, D. C.

ENCLOSURE B-2

79TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 5521

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 19, 1946

Mr. LARCADE introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds

A BILL

To provide for the erection of a World War II memorial.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized and directed
4 to erect, with the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts, at
5 a suitable location on property of the United States in the
6 District of Columbia or in Arlington County, Virginia, a
7 memorial to the members of the armed forces of the United
8 States who fought in World War II. Such memorial shall
9 consist of a statute the model for which shall be the photo-
10 graph made by Joe Rosenthal of six servicemen planting

1 the flag of the United States of America on Mount Suribachi,
2 Iwo Jima Island.

3 SEC. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated not to
4 exceed the sum of \$100,000 to carry out the provisions
5 of this Act.

79TH CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 5521

A BILL

To provide for the erection of a World War II
memorial.

By Mr. LARCADE

FEBRUARY 19, 1946

Referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and
Grounds

March 4, 1946.

Dear Mr. Lanham:

The Commission's attention has been called to Bill H.R. 5521 introduced in the House of Representatives on February 19th by Mr. Larcade "to provide for the erection of World War II Memorial".

A copy of this bill was referred to the sculptor member of the Commission of Fine Arts, Honorable Lee Lawrie, who reports as follows:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled: That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized and directed to erect, with the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts at a suitable location on property of the United States in the District of Columbia or in Arlington County, Va., a memorial to the members of the armed forces of the United States who fought in World War II".

The foregoing part of the Bill suggests a great national memorial to all those who fought in this War. To realize the finest memorial to the armed forces it should be desirable to hold a competition and to invite the best known and ablest sculptors and architects to submit designs, and as well to let unknown men also show their designs. The competition should be judged by a competent jury composed of eminent artists and laymen and finally by The Commission of Fine Arts.

The bill further states: "Such memorial shall consist of a statue the model for which shall be the photograph made by Joe Rosenthal of six service men planting the flag of the United States on Mount Suribachi, Iwo Jima Island".

If, in the opinion of the jury and The Commission of Fine Arts, such a group made from the famous photograph of Joseph Rosenthal is the finest design in the competition, then it should receive the award.

Section 2 of the bill states: "There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed the sum of \$100,000 to carry out the provisions of this Act".

One hundred thousand dollars, considering present prices for materials, wages for labor, and fees for sculptor and architect, is not enough to create, design, and produce a

March 1, 1935.

Dear Mr. Lamm:

The Commission's attention has been called to the fact that the bill introduced in the House of Representatives on January 19th, 1935, by Mr. Lamm, provides for the erection of a "World War Memorial".

A copy of this bill was referred to the committee member of the Commission of Fine Arts, Honorable Leo J. Ryan, who reports as follows:

"As it appears by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled: That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized and directed to erect, with the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts at a suitable location on property of the United States in the District of Columbia or in Arlington County, Va., a memorial to the members of the armed forces of the United States who fought in World War II."

The foregoing part of the bill suggests a great national memorial to all those who fought in this war. To realize the finest memorial to the armed forces it would be desirable to hold a competition and to invite the best known and ablest sculptors and architects to submit designs, and as well to let unknown men also show their designs. The competition should be judged by a competent jury composed of eminent artists and laymen and finally by the Commission of Fine Arts.

The bill further states: "Such memorial shall consist of a statue the model for which shall be the photograph made by the Government of six service men planting the flag of the United States on Mount Suribachi, Two Days Island."

It, in the opinion of the Navy and the Commission of Fine Arts, such a group made from the famous photograph of Joseph P. Kennedy as the finest design in the competition, then it should receive the award.

Section 8 of the bill states: "There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed the sum of \$100,000 to carry out the provisions of this Act."

One hundred thousand dollars, constituting present prices for materials, wages for labor, and fees for sculptor and architect, is not enough to erect, design, and produce a

A BILL

H. R. 6521

great national monument to the men of the United States armed forces who fought, sacrificed, and won in the most terrible war in the history of the world.

The Commission of Fine Arts concur in Mr. Lawrie's report and respectfully suggest to your Committee that the bill in its present form be not approved. If it is the judgment of the Committee to consider further a World War II Memorial in Washington, we respectfully suggest that the matter be given further consideration with a view toward holding a national competition to select the designers who might well comprise a collaborative team of artists consisting of an architect, a sculptor, a landscape architect, and a mural painter.

Sincerely yours,

GILMORE D. CLARKE,
Chairman.

Honorable Fritz G. Lanham, Chairman,
Committee of Public Buildings and Grounds,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT C-1

... ..

1-1

February 23, 1946.

Dear General Henry:

Under date of May 23, 1945, you submitted plaster models for a Medal of Freedom, and you were advised by letter of June 4, 1945, that "The Commission of Fine Arts approve the models, in-so-far as the general idea and the character of the workmanship are concerned." There was no objection to the model for the reverse, which portrayed the Liberty Bell.

However, the Commission took decided exception to the model for the obverse, which was intended to portray the head of the statue of Freedom surmounting the Capitol dome. The criticism by the Commission was:

"The face on the obverse of the model submitted looks like that of a young woman; the helmet is out of scale and should be made larger and less indicative of a German helmet."

Thereupon, the Office of the Quartermaster General arranged to have a model made of the head of Freedom, based on a photograph of the full sized model of the statue, which is in the Smithsonian Institution. After months of waiting, a photograph of the revised model for the medal was received by this Commission on February 18th, and was given attention by the Commission of Fine Arts at a meeting held February 22d. The Commission are not satisfied with the photograph, and respectfully ask that the model be submitted for consideration.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

GILMORE D. CLARKE,

Chairman.

Major General S. G. Henry,
Assistant Chief of Staff,
War Department,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT D

February 22, 1941

Dear General Henry:

I have had the honor to receive your letter of January 18, 1941, regarding the Medal of Freedom.

The Medal of Freedom, which was established by Act of Congress, June 4, 1942, was

originally intended to be awarded to those who have rendered exceptional service to the Nation.

There was no objection to the Medal of Freedom being awarded to the person who has rendered

exceptional service to the Nation, and the Medal of Freedom was established by Act of Congress, June 4, 1942.

However, the Commission took exception to the Medal of Freedom being awarded to the person who has rendered

exceptional service to the Nation, and the Medal of Freedom was established by Act of Congress, June 4, 1942.

The Commission has decided to award the Medal of Freedom to the person who has rendered

exceptional service to the Nation, and the Medal of Freedom was established by Act of Congress, June 4, 1942. The Commission has decided to award the Medal of Freedom to the person who has rendered

exceptional service to the Nation, and the Medal of Freedom was established by Act of Congress, June 4, 1942.

The Commission has decided to award the Medal of Freedom to the person who has rendered

exceptional service to the Nation, and the Medal of Freedom was established by Act of Congress, June 4, 1942.

The Commission has decided to award the Medal of Freedom to the person who has rendered

exceptional service to the Nation, and the Medal of Freedom was established by Act of Congress, June 4, 1942.

The Commission has decided to award the Medal of Freedom to the person who has rendered

exceptional service to the Nation, and the Medal of Freedom was established by Act of Congress, June 4, 1942.

The Commission has decided to award the Medal of Freedom to the person who has rendered

exceptional service to the Nation, and the Medal of Freedom was established by Act of Congress, June 4, 1942.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. CLARK,

Chairman.

Major General H. H. Henry,
Assistant Chief of Staff,
War Department,
Washington, D. C.

February 27, 1946.

Major General U. S. Grant 3rd, Chairman,
National Capital Park & Planning Commission,
Interior Building, Washington 5, D.C.

Dear General Grant:

When you showed the Commission studies for the development of the Washington Municipal Airport, you advised that it is the intention of the Airport officials to permit one of the oil companies to erect a service station between two drives, one for traffic approaching the air terminal and the other for traffic leaving the terminal.

With the increased volume of traffic which is bound to occur as the facilities of the Airport are increased, it would seem to me to be unwise to permit the construction of a service station between two driveways, each drive providing for traffic in opposite directions. The slower moving vehicles are accustomed to keep to the right and hence it has become the habit of the traveling public to anticipate turn outs to access drives, intersecting highways and service stations on the right hand side; to construct a service station between the drives means the traffic turning out to reach the station must travel in the fast lanes. This creates a hazard and our experience in the New York area has adequately demonstrated this. It is true that there are a number of gas stations erected between driveways designed for traffic in opposing directions, but I am confident that such a device will not be tolerated on new projects.

For a number of years I have opposed placing gasoline stations between driveways and in Westchester County we have placed gas stations opposite one another on both sides of the driveways, in spite of the fact that there was a good deal of pressure from the oil companies to erect stations between one way drives in order to save the cost of operating expenses. Wherever a gas station is required, we have found that in the long run the extra cost of operation is adequately justified in consideration of the volume of traffic which would justify construction of the service station.

The approach to the Washington Airport might not justify two buildings, and it might be better, if one is erected, to have it situated along the right hand lane of the traffic leaving the airport since this traffic is not so likely to be hurried. However, that is a matter for the airport officials and the oil companies to determine.

I am glad to pass along my experience in relation to this particular problem because I am firm in my opinion that a serious ~~mistake~~ will be made if the service station is erected between two drives carrying opposing traffic.

I hope you will pass along the Planning Commission's study for the Airport showing the possible arrangement of proposed new buildings to Commissioner Reynolds for his consideration.

Sincerely yours,

GILMORE D. CLARKE,

Chairman

EXHIBIT E

January 27, 1944

Major General T. A. Smith, Chief,
National Technical Council on Aviation,
Washington 25, D.C.

Dear General Smith:

When you showed the proposed station for the development
of the Washington National Airport, I was struck by the fact that it is the intention of
the airport officials to permit use of the old terminal to serve a service
station between the airport and the existing terminal and the existing
the other for traffic leaving the terminal.

With the increase in volume of traffic which is bound to occur
at the facilities of the airport and terminal, it is only a matter of time before
to permit the construction of a service station between the two existing, such as
providing for traffic in opposite directions. The proposed station would
be required to keep to the right and hence it is necessary to provide
to anticipate turn outs to service drives, interlocking lights and service
stations on the right hand side; to construct a service station between the drives
and the traffic turning out to reach the station must travel in the left lane.
It creates a hazard and our experience in the New York area has repeatedly
demonstrated this. It is true that the use of a station has existed
between driveways designed for traffic in opposing directions, but I am convinced
that such a device will not be tolerated on new projects.

Of a number of years I have opposed the proposed station
between driveways and in Westchester County we have placed our stations opposite
to another on both sides of the driveway, in spite of the fact that there was
a good deal of pressure from the oil companies to erect stations between one way
drives in order to save the cost of operating expenses. However, a gas station
is required, we have found that in the long run the extra cost of operation is
justified in consideration of the volume of traffic which would result
in operation of the service station.

The approach to the Washington National Airport must not justify
to building, and it might be better, if one is created, to have it situated
along the right hand side of the traffic leaving the airport since this traffic
is not so likely to be hindered. However, that is a matter for the airport officials
and the oil companies to determine.

I am glad to hear about my experience in relation to this
attention problem because I am firm in my opinion that a serious mistake will be
made if the service station is erected between the drives carrying opposing traffic.
I hope you will pass along the Planning Commission's study.

or the airport showing the possible arrangement of proposed new buildings to
Commissioner Reynolds for his consideration.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM A. CLARK

Chairman

EXHIBIT E

February 25, 1946.

My dear Mr. Lynn:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on February 22nd, were pleased to consider with you the designs submitted for changes in the Senate and House of Representatives chambers.

The Commission approve in principle the designs prepared by the firm of Harbeson, Hough, Livingston and Larson, Consulting Architects, of Philadelphia, in collaboration with Mr. Francis P. Sullivan, Architect, of Washington.

The Commission realize that lighting, acoustical, and air conditioning problems remain to be solved, and understand that when this has been done more complete designs will be submitted to the Commission for review. These mechanical phases of the problem are reflected, more particularly, in the design of the ceilings. The Commission prefer curved surfaces to flat surfaces on the ceilings and hope sincerely that the engineers may solve this problem successfully, in general based upon the two schemes submitted by the Consulting Architects.

It will help materially to solve the problem of the design of the House Chamber if the busts of former Speakers could be placed elsewhere and I trust that you may be able to prevail upon those in authority to allow this to be done. The Commission also prefer to have the Brumidi fresco carefully removed and preserved in an appropriate setting elsewhere.

The Commission are pleased that you approve of the use of an appropriate fabric for the gallery walls of both chambers instead of unsatisfactory acoustical tile.

We wish to assure you that the Commission will be at your service promptly in connection with this important matter, and will arrange for a meeting whenever the architects are ready with their designs.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

GILMORE D. CLARKE,

Chairman

HONORABLE DAVID LYNN,

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL,

WASHINGTON, D. C.

EXHIBIT F

• 344 •

DATE OF 20 1011 111111 111111

[Faint, illegible handwritten text]

§ 87(2)(b) of the Freedom of Information Law

125. 1210

THE CIVIL SERVICE

1971-72 25 20 1000000

* C * U 24010420015

F



THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS
1741 NEW YORK AVENUE, N. W. - WASHINGTON 6, D. C.

For Immediate Release

AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS
CALLS FOR IMMEDIATE PROVISION OF
WORKING SPACE FOR PRESIDENT TRUMAN

The A.I.A. recommends temporary structure to care for the immediate needs of the President's working staff and urges a comprehensive long-range study by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and the Public Buildings Administration to solve the problem once and for all.

In a recent statement The A.I.A. says:

It is unfortunate that the controversy concerning the White House additions should have been terminated, for the moment at least, in a manner which makes no provision for the space required by the President. For it can scarcely have been the intention of those who opposed these additions to prevent the President from having suitable and convenient office space.

The American Institute of Architects suggests that this requirement be met immediately by the construction of a temporary structure raised over West Executive Avenue and adjacent to the State Department building. This structure could be erected economically and expeditiously and would meet the President's need as quickly as the original scheme, in spite of all the delays which have occurred. The building would be an unsightly makeshift but this would be an advantage, because for that very reason it would not be allowed to remain indefinitely.

Immediate needs having been met in this fashion, the National Capital Park and Planning Commission should be required to prepare, in consultation with the Public Buildings Administration, an overall plan of the area immediately adjacent to the White House for the purpose of solving, in a permanent fashion, the requirements for executive offices. This long-range plan could be studied with due deliberation, and its execution would permit removing the existing executive offices

on the White House grounds as well as the temporary structure above suggested. This would permit the restoration of the White House in accordance with its status in 1902 as the residence of the President.

We believe that our recommendation is in accord with the ideas expressed in the statement issued by the Commission of Fine Arts on January 29, in which it said that it "reaffirms the position taken by the Commission of 1902, and subsequently adhered to, that the entire West Wing housing the President's Offices be considered of a temporary nature until such time as more suitable offices shall be provided elsewhere."

The manner in which the public has responded in the effort to prevent continuing additions to the White House is an indication of the importance of preserving traditions for our most cherished national buildings. Theodore Roosevelt, when confronted with similar proposals during his term of office, was kind enough to recognize the efforts then made by The American Institute of Architects to preserve the White House and, in a letter to the Institute's president, of that time, said:

"Now that I am about to leave office there is something I should like to say through you to The American Institute of Architects. During my incumbency of the Presidency the White House, under Mr. McKim's direction, was restored to the beauty, dignity and simplicity of its original plan. It is now, without and within, literally the ideal house for the head of a great democratic republic. It should be a matter of pride and honorable obligation to the whole Nation to prevent its being in any way marred. If I had it in my power as I leave office, I would like to leave as a legacy to you and The American Institute of Architects the duty of preserving a perpetual 'eye of Guardianship' over the White House to see that it is kept unchanged and unmarred from this time on."

The American Institute of Architects hopes that the solution it has offered complies with the spirit of Theodore Roosevelt's desire in a manner that will be acceptable to all concerned.

The first point to be considered is the question of the validity of the evidence presented in the report.

It is not necessary to discuss this point in detail.

The second point to be considered is the question of the reliability of the evidence presented in the report.

The third point to be considered is the question of the sufficiency of the evidence presented in the report.

The fourth point to be considered is the question of the relevance of the evidence presented in the report.

The fifth point to be considered is the question of the materiality of the evidence presented in the report.

The sixth point to be considered is the question of the probative value of the evidence presented in the report.

The seventh point to be considered is the question of the prejudicial effect of the evidence presented in the report.

The eighth point to be considered is the question of the balancing of the probative value against the prejudicial effect of the evidence presented in the report.

The ninth point to be considered is the question of the exclusion of the evidence presented in the report.

The tenth point to be considered is the question of the admission of the evidence presented in the report.

The eleventh point to be considered is the question of the weight to be given to the evidence presented in the report.

The twelfth point to be considered is the question of the effect of the evidence presented in the report on the jury.

The thirteenth point to be considered is the question of the effect of the evidence presented in the report on the judge.

The fourteenth point to be considered is the question of the effect of the evidence presented in the report on the court.

The fifteenth point to be considered is the question of the effect of the evidence presented in the report on the law.

The sixteenth point to be considered is the question of the effect of the evidence presented in the report on the facts.

The seventeenth point to be considered is the question of the effect of the evidence presented in the report on the issues.

The eighteenth point to be considered is the question of the effect of the evidence presented in the report on the verdict.

The nineteenth point to be considered is the question of the effect of the evidence presented in the report on the judgment.

The twentieth point to be considered is the question of the effect of the evidence presented in the report on the case.

The twenty-first point to be considered is the question of the effect of the evidence presented in the report on the trial.

The twenty-second point to be considered is the question of the effect of the evidence presented in the report on the proceedings.

The twenty-third point to be considered is the question of the effect of the evidence presented in the report on the litigation.

The twenty-fourth point to be considered is the question of the effect of the evidence presented in the report on the dispute.

The twenty-fifth point to be considered is the question of the effect of the evidence presented in the report on the controversy.

145 East 32d Street,
New York,
February 25, 1946.

Hon. H. G. Crim, Chief Usher,

The White House,

Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Crim:

Since making the suggestion of the possibility of engaging the professional services of Mr. Frederick Law Olmsted, Landscape Architect, in connection with the contemplated rehabilitation of the grounds of the White House it has occurred to me that the designs for the two gardens at the south side of the House might be accomplished in a more sympathetic manner if the services of a woman instead of a man is engaged. The two ladies, whose names I shall give you, are especially well qualified by long experience to solve this problem with a distinction which I am sure cannot be secured in any other way.

The two ladies, either one of whom would be most acceptable, are Mrs. Beatrix Farrand of Reef Point, Bar Harbor, Maine, or Miss Marian C. Coffin of 165 Bishop Street, New Haven, Conn. Mrs. Farrand is the consultant to Yale and Princeton Universities; the charm of the plantings on the campus of each one of these two institutions is due entirely to her. She has planned also many of the great gardens of this country. Miss Coffin for years also has planned great gardens, including those for the DuPont's at Wilmington, Delaware.

I commend these ladies to you with the conviction that the results will be worthy of the home of the President of the United States.

Sincerely yours,

GILMORE D. CLARK,

Chairman.

EXHIBIT H

145 East 53rd Street,
New York,
February 25, 1943.

Hon. E. C. Clegg, Chief Clerk,

The White House,

Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Clegg:

Since making the suggestion of the possibility of engaging the professional services of Mr. Frederick Law Olmsted, landscape architect, in connection with the contemplated rehabilitation of the grounds of the White House it has occurred to me that the ideal for the two ladies is the south side of the House might be accomplished in a more sympathetic manner if the services of a woman instead of a man is engaged. The two ladies, whose names I shall give you, are especially well qualified by long experience to solve this problem with a distinction which I am sure cannot be secured in any other way.

The two ladies, either one of whom would be most acceptable, are Mrs. Beatrice Lawrence of West Point, New Harbor, Maine, or Miss Marion G. Coffin of 105 Bishop Street, New Haven, Conn. Mrs. Lawrence is the consultant to Yale and Princeton Universities; the name of the buildings on the campus of each one of these two institutions is due entirely to her. She has planned also many of the great gardens of this country. Miss Coffin for years also has planned great gardens, including those for the White House at Washington, D.C.

I am sure these ladies to you with the conviction that the results will be worthy of the home of the President of the United States.

Sincerely yours,

Elizabeth B. Wood

Chairman

145 East 32d Street,
New York 16, N.Y.,
February 18, 1946.

Dear Mr. DeLue:

This will acknowledge your letter of February 13th. I have no knowledge of the statement contained in the first paragraph of your letter to the effect that certain coins may be redesigned due to the termination of a stated period of issue. However, I am asking Mr. Caemmerer, Secretary of this Commission, to inquire concerning this matter and, when I hear from him, I shall write to you again.

The new Roosevelt dime was designed by an employee of the Mint, John R. Sinnock. The Commission were not apprised of the intention to mint this coin until a design was submitted by Mrs. Nellie Ross, Director of the Mint. There was no time, according to Mrs. Ross, to engage the services of a sculptor or medallist because the new dime had to be ready for issue on the last anniversary of Mr. Franklin D. Roosevelt's birth. In spite of the fact that Mr. Sinnock received much help and criticism from the sculptor member of the Commission, Mr. Lee Lawrie, the new dime is probably not an outstanding coin. The Commission of Fine Arts have not acted to approve it.

The incidents surrounding the design of the Roosevelt dime gave me the opportunity to write two letters to Mrs. Ross urging upon her the importance of engaging only the most competent talent in this country in connection with the design of our coins. Of course she sprung to the defense of Mr. Sinnock; I told her that, while Mr. Sinnock may have had a part in the design of some of our coins, the finest coins we have were designed by medallists of outstanding reputation and I urged that when it is contemplated to redesign other coins that only the most able talent be considered.

Be assured that the Commission of Fine Arts are wholly in sympathy with your contention that "designs should be accepted only from sculptors who have earned distinction in this specialized field." We are prepared to do all we can to the end that only the best possible results may obtain. Of course, I should be delighted to discuss this matter further and in more detail with you and with other members of the National Sculpture Society.

Sincerely yours,

GILMORE D. CLARKE,

Chairman.

Mr. Donald DeLue, President,
National Sculpture Society,
1083 Fifth Avenue,
New York 28, N.Y.

EXHIBIT I

145 West 10th Street,
New York, N.Y.
February 12, 1934.

Dear Mr. Deane:

This will acknowledge your letter of January 10th. I have no knowledge of the statement contained in the letter regarding your letter to the effect that certain coins may be retained and to the termination of a stated period of time. However, I am writing Mr. Deane, Secretary of the National Sculpture Society, to inform him of this statement, as it is concerning this matter and, when I hear from him, I shall tell you again.

The new resolution which was carried by an envelope of the first John A. Sinnock. The Commission was not informed of the intention to mint this coin until a year ago. It was submitted to the Director of the Mint. There was no time, according to the laws, to engage the services of a sculptor or medalist because the new dime had to be ready for issue on the first anniversary of Mr. Franklin D. Roosevelt's birth. In spite of the fact that Mr. Sinnock received much help and criticism from the sculptor member of the Commission, Mr. Lee Jarvis, the new dime is probably not a great success. The Commission of the Arts have not voted to approve it.

The incidents surrounding the design of the Roosevelt dime gave me the opportunity to write two letters to Mr. Deane, writing upon the importance of engaging only the most competent talent in this country in connection with the design of our coins. Of course the spring to the defense of Mr. Sinnock; I told him that, while Mr. Sinnock may have had a part in the design of some of our coins, the finest coins we have were designed by medalists of outstanding reputation and I urged that when it is contemplated to redesign other coins that only the most able talent be considered.

Be assured that the Commission of the Arts are wholly in sympathy with your contention that "designs should be selected only from sculptors who have earned distinction in this specialized field." We are prepared to do all we can to the end that only the best possible talent may obtain. Of course, I should be delighted to discuss this matter further and in more detail with you and with other members of the National Sculpture Society.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM L. BAKER

Chairman

Mr. Donald Deane, President,
National Sculpture Society,
1233 Fifth Avenue,
New York 28, N.Y.

COPY

March 4, 1946.

My dear Mr. Secretary:

The Commission of Fine Arts understand that a new design for any United States coin may be adopted by the Treasury Department after a coin has been in use for 25 years. Inasmuch as the Lincoln penny, designed by Victor Brenner, has been in use since 1909 and the fifty-cent piece, designed by Adolph A. Weinman, has been in use since 1916, the Commission respectfully recommend that new designs for these coins be adopted.

In this connection the Commission believe that, in justice to the many outstanding medallists of this country, a limited competition, to be conducted by the Treasury Department for the purpose of securing outstanding designs in the form of models for these coins, would be appropriate in the circumstances. If this suggestion meets with your approval we shall be pleased to send to you, or to the Director of the Mint, a list of names of outstanding medallists who would be thoroughly competent designers for these coins.

The National Sculpture Society have expressed a particular interest in this matter; they believe that American medallists should be given the opportunity to submit designs for new United States coins and they express the desire that the method of selection be arranged on the basis of limited competitions.

We shall be pleased to cooperate with you and with the Director of the Mint in these matters.

Most respectfully,

GILMORE D. CLARKE,

Chairman.

Honorable Fred M. Vinson,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT J

March 2, 1964

My dear Mr. Secretary:

The Commission of Fine Arts has been asked to submit a design for any United States coin that may be issued by the Treasury Department after a coin has been in use for 25 years. I am pleased to be asked to submit a design for a coin that will be issued in 1969 and 1970. The design of the coin, designed by Victor Brenner, has been in use since 1916. The Commission respectfully requests that you will be pleased to submit a design for the coin.

In this connection the Commission believes that it is desirable to the many outstanding artists of this country, a limited competition, to be conducted by the Treasury Department for the purpose of selecting outstanding designs in the form of medals for these coins, would be appropriate in the circumstances. If this suggestion meets with your approval it will be pleased to send to you, or to the Director of the Mint, a list of names of outstanding medalists who would be thoroughly competent designers for these coins.

The National Sculpture Society has expressed a particular interest in this matter; they will, however, be glad to submit designs should we give the opportunity to submit designs for the new United States coins and they express the desire that the nation of selection be arranged on the basis of limited competitions.

We will be pleased to cooperate with you and with the Director of the Mint in these matters.

Very respectfully,

WILLIAM A. BRADY

Chairman

Honorable Fred L. Vinson,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

March 2

February 22, 1946.

Dear Mr. Underwood:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting today, approved the designs for the "Continued Treatment Building" and the Laundry and Service Building," for St. Elizabeth's Hospital, submitted with your letter of February 11th. On the recommendation of Mr. Reinhard and Mr. Murphy, the Commission suggest the following changes in the Continued Treatment Building:

1. Extend the center motif forward of the windows about 8 inches.
2. Study the plan of the entrance vestibule and make it more "open" in character instead of the rather narrow pinched-in plan on the submitted drawings.

It is understood that the completed drawings will embody these changes.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

GILMORE D. CLARKE,

Chairman.

Mr. Gilbert Stanley Underwood,
Supervising Architect,
Public Buildings Administration,
Federal Works Agency,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT K

February 22, 1943.

Dear Mr. Underwood:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting today, approved the designs for the "Continued Treatment Building" and the laundry and service building, for St. Elizabeth's Hospital, submitted with your letter of February 11th. On the recommendation of Mr. Reinhardt and Mr. Murphy, the Commission suggest the following changes in the Continued Treatment Building:

1. Extend the center motif toward the entrance about 2 inches.
 2. Study the plan of the entrance vestibule and make it more open in character instead of the rather narrow finished-in plan on the submitted drawings.
- It is understood that the completed drawings will embody these changes.

Very truly yours,

Walter Dill Scott

Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts

Washington, D. C.

Mr. Edward Kelly Underwood,
Superintendent, St. Elizabeth's Hospital,
Public Health Administration,
Federal Bureau of Investigation,
Washington, D. C.

W. D. S.

February 28, 1946.

Dear Mr. Thompson:

On February 22, 1946, Chairman Clarke and Mr. Lawrie inspected Potomac Park with a view to determining on a location for the Leif Ericson statue in the National Capital, for which legislation is pending in Congress. It seemed desirable to the Commission of Fine Arts that the statue should have a location on the waterfront, and the site selected is on the north side of the Inlet Bridge, where the statue would face the river.

The Commission of Fine Arts would appreciate it very much if the Office of National Capital Parks would prepare a plot plan in the form of a location plan that could be considered by the Commission at their next meeting.

Sincerely yours,

H. P. Caemmerer,

Secretary.

Mr. Harry T. Thompson,
Assistant Superintendent,
Office of National Capital Parks,
National Park Service,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT L

February 2, 1943.

Dear Mr. Thompson:

On February 27, 1943, William H. Hays and Mr. Hays
inspected the site with a view to determining on a location
for the first station at the National Capital, for which
legislation is pending in Congress. It seemed desirable to the
Commission of the fact that the station should have a location on
the waterfront, and the site selected is on the north side of the
Inlet Bridge, where the station would face the river.
The Commission of the fact would appreciate it very

much if the Office of National Capital Planning would report a
plot plan in the form of a location plan that could be considered
by the Commission at their next meeting.

Sincerely yours,

W. H. Hays

Secretary.

Mr. Henry J. Thompson,
Assistant Secretary,
Office of National Capital Planning,
National Capital Planning,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

W. H. Hays

February 25, 1946.

My dear Senator Green:

It is my understanding that you would like to know where on the United States Capitol grounds the Commission of Fine Arts deem it appropriate to place the bronze statue of George Washington, by J. Q. A. Ward, the Congress has authorized.

Following a meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts on February 22nd, I had an opportunity to study this problem with Mr. Lee Lawrie, Sculptor member of the Commission. After reviewing several possible locations on the Capitol Grounds, Mr. Lawrie and I are convinced that the statue should be situated in the most outstanding location, namely, on the central axis of the East front of the Capitol. If it is soon contemplated to extend the central part of the Capitol to the East, then it might be well to wait until this work has been authorized, after which the location of the statue could be studied in connection with this addition. If, on the other hand, it is your judgment that we should proceed on the basis of existing conditions, then a careful study may be made to determine the exact location and the details related to an appropriate design for a pedestal.

If you favor the general location I have indicated, we shall be glad to submit the suggestion to Mr. Lynn for the consideration of matters of detail in connection with the exact location and the design of the pedestal. I am certain the Commission of Fine Arts will approve the scheme I have outlined.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

GILMORE D. CLARKE,

Chairman.

Hon. Theodore F. Green,
United States Senate,
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT M

February 22, 1945.

My dear Senator Green:

It is my understanding that you would like to know where on the United States Capitol grounds the Commission of Fine Arts deem it appropriate to place the bronze statue of George Washington, by J. W. Ward, the Congress has authorized.

Following a meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts on February 22nd, I had an opportunity to study this problem with Mr. Lee Larrie, Sculptor member of the Commission. After reviewing several possible locations on the Capitol Grounds, Mr. Larrie and I are convinced that the statue should be situated in the most outstanding location, namely, on the central axis of the East front of the Capitol. If it is soon contemplated to extend the central part of the Capitol to the East, then it might be well to wait until this work has been authorized, after which the location of the statue could be studied in connection with this addition. If, on the other hand, it is your judgment that we should proceed on the basis of existing conditions, then a careful study may be made to determine the exact location and the details related to an appropriate design for a pedestal.

If you favor the general location I have indicated, we shall be glad to submit the suggestion to Mr. Lynn for the consideration of matters of detail in connection with the exact location and the design of the pedestal. I am certain the Commission of Fine Arts will approve the scheme I have outlined.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

CLAYTON D. CLARK,

Chairman.

Hon. Theodore F. Green,

United States Senate,

Washington, D.C.

CLAYTON D.

COPY

UNITED STATES SENATE

March 6, 1946.

Mr. Gilmore D. Clarke, Chairman,
The Commission of Fine Arts,
Interior Department Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Clarke:

Thank you for your letter of February 25th, advising me of the location suggested by the Commission of Fine Arts for the statue of George Washington which has been authorized by Congress but for which no funds have been appropriated!

I concur with your suggestion that it should be placed on the central axis of the East front of the Capitol and trust that the other members of the Commission will approve this site.

At the first opportunity I intend again to have the Senate Committee on Appropriations consider an appropriation for this statue and do hope that Congress will approve it.

Thank you for consulting me about this matter!

Yours sincerely,

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

TFG:F

EXHIBIT M-1

copy

UNITED STATES SENATE

March 2, 1948.

Mr. Wilmore D. Clarke, Chairman,
The Commission of Fine Arts,
Interior Department Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Clarke:

Thank you for your letter of February 25th, advising me of the location suggested by the Commission of Fine Arts for the statue of George Washington which has been authorized by Congress but for which no funds have been appropriated. I concur with your suggestion that it should be placed on the central axis of the East front of the Capitol and trust that the other members of the Commission will approve this site. At the first opportunity I intend again to have the Senate Committee on Appropriations consider an appropriation for this statue so do hope that Congress will approve it. Thank you for committing me about this matter!

Yours sincerely,

WILLIAM F. BARKER

WFB

ENCLOSURE 1-1